

REMARKS

Claims 18-42 remain in this application. Claims 1-17 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 18-42 have been added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been cancelled. Therefore the rejection is believed to be moot.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection - Gast

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046532 issued to Gast (hereinafter referred to as "Gast"). These claims have been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Gast.

As an initial matter, Gast may not represent effective prior art to the present application because of Applicant's early date of invention. However, while making this statement, and reserving the right to swear behind Gast in the future, the Applicant chooses at this time to present arguments pointing out the significant differences between the present claims and the disclosure of Gast. Again, the Applicant makes no admission that Gast represents effective prior art against the present application and the Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Gast in the future.

Turning now to the significant differences between the present claims and the disclosure of Gast, claim 18 recites a system comprising *“a network interface coupleable with a public network to receive a first client message and first data that is encrypted according to a wireless security format and to receive a second client message and second data that is encrypted according to a wired security format; a selection system coupled with the network interface to select a first security format conversion for the first data and to select a second security format conversion for the second data; and a conversion system coupled with the selection system to perform the first security format conversion on the first wireless security format encrypted data and to perform the second security format conversion on the second wired security format encrypted data”*.

Gast does not teach or reasonably suggest these limitations. In particular, as understood by Applicants, Gast does not teach or reasonably suggest a system that performs security format conversions on both wireless security format encrypted data and wired security format encrypted data. Gast does mention SSL at paragraph [0024] and does mention WTLS at paragraph [0030], however Gast does not teach or reasonably suggest using a common interface to receive first data that is encrypted according to a wireless security format and second data that is encrypted according to a wired security format. Nor does Gast teach or reasonably suggest a conversion system to perform a first security format conversion on the wireless security format encrypted data and to perform a second security format conversion on the wired security format encrypted data.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 requires every element of the claimed invention be identically shown in a single prior art reference. The Federal Circuit has indicated that the standard for measuring lack of novelty by anticipation is strict identity. *“For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. Section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference.”* In *Re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

For at least these reasons, claim 18 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Gast. Independent claims 29, 36, and 40 and their respective dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 9-29-05

Brent E. Vecchia
Brent E. Vecchia
Reg. No. 48,011

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980